



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PS- #1187  
UTILITY EXPLORATION AND MARKING**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

*Updated:* August 7, 2012

1. Is there a job walk scheduled?

**ANSWER: No**

*Added on 8/7/2012:*

2. Re: Work Package #1: Are there any "as-builds" available for the sites in Attachment?

**ANSWER: This is answered in the RFP already. It essentially says, "maybe" but don't count on them.**

3. Re: Work Package #1: What degree of accuracy is expected in the digital (G.I.S.) deliverable? Is a survey grade set of data preferred, or is S.L.O. County looking for something more along the lines of screen digitizing based on scanned as-built drawings? Also, would a system of georeferenced as-built images fulfill this requirement?

**ANSWER: We want to be able to import this data into our GIS database. So, image files are not sufficient. Proposers should describe the methods, equipment, procedures, datum, and horizontal tolerance employed to provide the electronic data documentation of the utility mapping. Proposers can submit "options" if they believe there are sufficient cost / detail tradeoffs.**

4. Re: Work Package #1: The RFP mentions that the geographic information systems deliverable needs to conform to the schema defined by the S.L.O. County Planning Department. We have reviewed the GIS requirements on the county Planning website, and understand the requirements. However, the actual schema of the existing data is unclear. In order to match the existing schema exactly and provide an accurate bid, an example of existing data would be helpful. Can this example be made available to us?

**ANSWER: A copy of existing fiber schema is being provided at the Purchasing web site: [http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/GSA/Purchasing/Current Formal Bids and Proposals.htm](http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/GSA/Purchasing/Current%20Formal%20Bids%20and%20Proposals.htm). The County does not have a required schema for gas, water, sewer, and electricity.**

**EVIDENCE BASED JAIL TREATMENT PROGRAMS FOR SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY JAIL INMATES  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**However, the County is requesting the size and material type (where applicable) of the pipe or conduit (steel, copper, PVC, etc.). The County would also request that GIS deliverables make note of any pull boxes and the type of material that the pull boxes are made of (concrete, steel, plastic, etc.). Lastly, the County is requesting a depth field for all underground features for the utilities requested in this RFP.**

5. Re: Work Package #2: The RFP states that “there are a number of other County locations for which existing ‘as-is’ utility maps are available [...] these areas will be made available [...] in a mutually agreeable format”. Are these utility maps available in a digital format such as CAD or GIS, or will these be provided in another format? If other, what format?

**ANSWER: GIS - The County relies heavily on toolsets provided by ESRI.**

6. Re: Work Package #2: I would like to know if you could give us an estimate on how many "permit to dig" USA calls on the average will we receive during a week or month period. That would help with the "not to exceed" cost estimate.

**ANSWER: No, we cannot provide a reliable number because the data is not available. When the construction was originally completed, no allowance was provided for a USA North dig alert contact.**

7. Re: Work Package #2: Would we have 24 to 48 hours to respond to the location to mark the utilities requested by (USA North).

**ANSWER: USA "requires" a minimum of 2 days. Vendors should apply their own best practice as to how long is typically needed and note which (24 or 48 hours) they quoted. Alternatively, they could provide two quotes, one on a 24 hour response and one on a 48 hour response.**